



2000 Powell St., Suite 600  
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA

[www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)

Brendan Grady  
[bgrady@scscertified.com](mailto:bgrady@scscertified.com)

# FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY SURVEILLANCE EVALUATION REPORT

**WI Dept. of Natural Resources – County Forest Program**

**SCS-FM/COC-00083G**

101 S. Webster St. PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921

[Joseph.Schwantes@wisconsin.gov](mailto:Joseph.Schwantes@wisconsin.gov)

<http://www.wisconsincountyforests.com>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
12/31/2009	12/13/2014

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
08/11/2012
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
10/25/2012

## Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

**FOREWORD**

<b>Cycle in annual surveillance audits</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual audit
<b>Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:</b>			
Wisconsin County Forests Program (WCFP)			

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing compliance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the SCS website [www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com).

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual / surveillance audits are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope audit would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC audit protocols. Rather, annual audits are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to the audit; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit.

## Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	5
1.3 Standards Employed .....	5
2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES .....	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities .....	5
3.0 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	11
4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION .....	12
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	12
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	15
5.0 STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	17
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	17
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable .....	18
6.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	18
7.0 CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE .....	18
8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	23
8.1 Social Information .....	23
8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide And Other Chemical Use .....	23
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL) .....	25
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	25
Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems .....	25
Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	26
Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	26
Appendix 5 – Pesticide Derogations .....	26
Appendix 6 – Detailed Observations.....	26
Appendix 7 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	50
Appendix 8 – Group Management Program Members .....	50

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

#### 1.1 Annual Audit Team

<b>Auditor Name:</b>	David Capen	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Lead Auditor
<p><b>Qualifications:</b> Dr. David E. Capen is a Professor Emeritus in the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources at the University of Vermont. He has a B.S.F. degree in Forestry from the University of Tennessee, an M.S. degree in Wildlife Management from the University of Maine, and a Ph.D. in Wildlife Science from Utah State University. He was an active member of the faculty at the University of Vermont from 1976 to 2010, maintaining a part-time research appointment since retiring from teaching in 2002. David is a Certified Wildlife Biologist and was a Certified Forester from 2002-2008. He has been a member of The Wildlife Society for more than 40 years; the Society of American Foresters for more than 20 years; a charter member of Society for Conservation Biology; and a member of several professional ornithological organizations. He has conducted numerous FSC audits in Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Indiana.</p>			
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Mike Ferrucci	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Team Auditor
<p><b>Qualifications:</b> Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. He is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci has 30 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 30 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over 30 years. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management, operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.</p>			
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	JoAnn Hanowski	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Team Auditor
<p><b>Qualifications:</b> JoAnn M. Hanowski was a senior research fellow at the University of Minnesota-Duluth’s Natural Resources Research Institute. She has considerable expertise evaluating the effects of forest management on wildlife habitat, and is currently working on research projects involving the response of birds to various forest management practices in stream and seasonal pond buffers and the development of indicators of forest and water health and sustainability in Minnesota and across the Great Lakes. She was a member of the forest bird technical team for the original GEIS and participated on the wildlife technical team that wrote forest management guidelines for Minnesota. She is a participant in a 14-year project for monitoring avian populations on the Chequamegon National Forest. She is currently a member of the riparian science technical committee that is investigating the effectiveness of Minnesota’s current guidelines for forest management in riparian systems. She has published 64 peer-</p>			

reviewed journal articles and over 75 reports in her 21 year tenure with the University of Minnesota. In 2005 JoAnn participated in the largest forest certification project ever conducted in the United States, the joint FSC/SFI certification of Minnesota's state lands. In 2006 and 2007 JoAnn contributed regional ecological expertise to the annual surveillance audits of the MN DNR's FSC and SFI certificates.

## 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	3
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	2
<b>D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</b>	<b>11</b>

## 1.3 Standards Employed

### 1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1.0	July 2010
FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005)	1.0	August 2009
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International ( <a href="http://www.fsc.org">www.fsc.org</a> ), the FSC-US ( <a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a> ) or the SCS Forest Conservation Program homepage ( <a href="http://www.scscertified.com/forestry">www.scscertified.com/forestry</a> ). Standards are also available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems ( <a href="http://www.scscertified.com">www.scscertified.com</a> ).		

## 2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES

### 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

<b>Date:</b> August 7, 2012	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
AmericInn Lodge, Merrill, WI	Opening meeting: Introductions, FSC update and audit protocols, review of field itinerary, and review of open CARs.
<b>Participants</b>	Jane Severt, Executive Director, Wisconsin County Forest Association (WCFA) Joe Schwantes, DNR County Forest Specialist, Group Certificate Manager Deirdre Raimo, Observer, USFS State and Private Forestry, Forest Legacy Program; Chris Martin, DNR, Public and Private Lands Forester Mark Heyde, DNR, Forest Certification Coordinator Mike Ferrucci, Auditor JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor Dave Capen, Auditor
<b>Date:</b> August 8, 2012	
FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes

Wood County Courthouse, Wisconsin Rapids, WI	Opening meeting: Introductions, audit protocols, review of field itinerary, questions and answers relating to audit standards.
<b>Participants, Opening meeting, Wood County:</b>	Dave Capen, Auditor Mark Heyde, Forest Certification Coordinator, DNR Fritz Schubert, Wood County Administrator Steve Grant, DNR Liaison Forester Steve Courtney, DNR, Area manager Wayne Hall, DNR, Wildlife Deirdre Raimo, USFS
Sale Number 656, South Bluff Block	Futurewood was the harvest contractor on this 92-acre sale, completed in 2010. The supervising forester from Futurewood was on site. Oak thinning/shelterwood; oak clearcut; two rock outcrops excluded from harvest. Detailed prescription was followed closely by contractor. A very clean harvest job. Interesting topography, thus a prescription with concern for the bluff community and aesthetics.
Sale Number 657, South Bluff Block	72 acres, Futurewood, started in 2010, but completed in 2012; crews were pulled off site for wet conditions, but evidence of rutting was not seen. Another clean harvest site with abundant residual forest and many trees marked to leave. Virtually no residual damage to crop trees. Adjacent landowners contacted before harvest, the standard practice in this county.
Sale Number 645, Hiles Block	59 acres, Lambert Forest Products; started in 2008, continued in 2010; and completed the day of the audit. A wet site where operations were stopped on two previous occasions. Very dry summer conditions allowed access recently. Forester with LFP was on site and appeared proud that the harvest was finally being completed. A few trees showed damage from equipment, but CF forester allowed them to be cut.
Sale No. 683, Hiles Block	54 acres, Futurewood, wet site and wet access road; harvest started in 2011 but finished in winter 2012. Salvage harvest, leaving clearcut with dense aspen regeneration. Bear cubs found in den during harvest; were rescued (with great publicity) and taken to rehab facility.
Sale No. 684, Hiles Block	63 acres, Twin Forest Products; sale has been sold but not harvested. Will be aspen clearcut (46 acres) and oak shelterwood (17 acres); residual trees marked to be retained in addition to retaining all pines.
Sale No. 646, Hiles Block	34 acres, Schreiner Forestry currently harvesting farther down a CF road. Only inspection of this harvest was an aspen clearcut finished 2 years ago. Aspen sprouts with 20-feet tall or more. Residual trees left during harvest are still standing.
<b>Additional participants, field audit:</b>	Heather Gerhart, Administrative Assistant Derrick Nellis LTE Forester Chad Schooley, Director, Parks and Recreation Jere Hamel, Forester, Futurewood Logging Bethany Polchowski, Forester, Lambert Timber

FMU/Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Price County Offices, Phillips WI	Opening meeting: Introductions, audit protocols, review of field itinerary, questions and answers relating to audit standards.
<b>Participants, Opening meeting, field audit, Price County:</b>	JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor Greg Mitchell, Forestry Team Leader, WI DNR Kyle Schmidt, Price County Liaison Forester, WI DNR Joe Grapa, Forester, Price County Corey Verdegan, Assistant Administrator, Price County Pat Beringer, Wildlife Biologist, WI DNR Eric Holm, Forest Administrator, Price County Carmen Hardin, Forest Hydrologist, WI DNR Tom Duke, District Forestry Leader, WI DNR Chris Martin, Forester, DNR County Forest Program Jane Severt, Executive Director, WI County Forest Association
Tract 19-11	This was a 50-year-old aspen stand that was clear cut to provide a younger age class in the landscape for wildlife habitat. Post-harvest green tree retention on the site was about 7% which included a 100ft RMZ along Rock Creek. The site was harvested in summer 2012 and is showing good regeneration.
Tract 19-10	This site was a 36-acre spruce plantation that was clearcut because of disease in the stand. Due to the condition of the existing trees on the site, little or no green tree retention was left on the site. The rationale for this was documented on the 2460 form. There is good aspen regeneration on the site and there is no plan for replanting conifers.
Holy Cross Trails	A multi-use trail system (ski, snowshoe, horse, mountain bike) owned by the County but primarily maintained by the user groups. County has memorandum of understanding with the user groups for the use and maintenance of the trails.
Tract 19-08	This harvest unit included an aspen clearcut and a selective harvest in a northern hardwood stand. The hardwood stand was harvested in the summer of 2011 and was marked to favor the removal of ash and to retain oak. There is good regeneration of sugar maple, oak and pine. Some concern that Penn Sedge is inhibiting regeneration in some areas of the stand.
Tract 23-10	An aspen clearcut was conducted on two stands (one 17 and one 25 acres). A red line was painted along the borders of wet meadows on the site and the logger was instructed not to enter this area with equipment. Green tree retention was achieved by prescription and was adequate to meet retention guidelines.
Solberg Lake County Park	This park has modern and rustic campsites, a beach and boat launch. Revenue from fees in this park exceed 80k/year. A non-paid park steward is on site 24/7 to manage the facility.
Solberg ATV trail	The County received grants to build this trail that links Phillips to the Chequamegon National Forest. The trail has several long bridges over wet areas and streams. The County contracts with ATV clubs to maintain the trail. The trail was well built and was in excellent

	condition.
Tract 9-10	This 12-acre red pine plantation was at rotation age and was clearcut. The harvest was done in the winter of 2010 and a contractor applied herbicide for initial site prep in July of 2012. The site will be furrowed in the fall of 2012 and planted in spring of 2013. A contractor was hired to apply the herbicide.
Tract 9-09	The County performed a 4 <sup>th</sup> intermediate thinning on a 14-acre red pine and 14-acre white pine plantation. The logger removed all aspen and orange-marked trees. The County plans to convert existing pine stands with good regeneration of hardwoods to hardwoods and retain plantations with less competition in pine.
Tract 8-10	This 92-acre aspen clearcut was comprised of 4 separate polygons. The landscape goal is to provide a diverse age of aspen for wildlife habitat. The site had a biomass harvest operation that utilized clean chips. An RMZ was left along the Flambeau River. Good green tree retention (old white pine) and adequate slash were retained on the site.
Tract 9-08	This harvest area had three treatments, a 26-acre spruce plantation removal due to disease, a 35-acre aspen regeneration harvest and a 5-acre selective harvest. Hardwood islands were left in the spruce plantation to meet the green tree retention guidelines and to promote hardwoods on the site. A biomass operator produced dirty chips from this sale. Landing sizes on biomass sites tend to be on the large size compared to non-biomass operations.
<b>Date:</b> August 9, 2012	
<b>FMU/Location/ sites visited</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
Taylor County Offices, Medford WI	Opening meeting: Introductions, audit protocols, review of field itinerary, questions and answers relating to audit standards.
<b>Participants, Opening meeting, field audit, Taylor County:</b>	Dave Capen, Auditor Mark Heyde, Forest Certification Coordinator, DNR Brad Ruesch, Taylor County Administrator Russ Aszmann, Assistant County Administrator Carmen Hardin, DNR Forest Hydrologist Tom Duke, DNR NW District Forestry Leader Jane Severt, Executive Director, WCFA Greg Mitchell, DNR, Price and Taylor Counties Team Leader Scott Lindow, DNR Liaison Forester Mark Schmidt, DNR Wildlife Biologist, Price and Taylor Counties
Sale 612, Tract 7-11	This is 163-acre sale, one stand with 85 acres of northern hardwoods selection harvest and a second stand with 78 acres of overstory removal. B&M Logging is doing the harvest, a new contractor for these managers. Nice job of marking trees for wildlife, other residuals, and an RMZ. Walking trails for hunters being mowed.
Sale 604, Tract 8-10.	A quick inspection of a seed tree harvest intended to regenerate white birch and red maple. Winter-only harvest specifications, leaving a list of green tree species.
Sale 607, Tract 2-11	This is a 44-acre marked harvest, which includes 40 acres of aspen



	clearcut and 4 acres of selection harvest in hardwood stand. Some white spruce in the stand, planted in 1952, but overtopped by aspen and hardwood. Well-marked for reasonable harvest to favor a mixed stand.
Sale 585, Tract 5-08	This is a 137-acre timber sale near Camp 8 Lake, site of a small campground and day-use area. ATV and snowmobile trails on the sale area and used for logging. Selection harvest intended to reduce BA from 115 to 80. Harvest recently completed by Smola Brothers Logging. BMPs followed well; 100-foot RMZ next to lake, and landing was clean. Residual forest stand looked good.
Sale 613, Tract 1-12	This is a 96-acre sale, with 93 acres of selection harvest and 3 acres of clearcut. An active harvest site, where Melvin DeLaurelle was interviewed—a skidder operator. Inspected selection cut in red oak stand, excellent result. Large trees marked for cutting by chainsaw crew. Twin Forest Products is the contractor.
Ice-age Trail	This popular Wisconsin hiking trail passes through county forest lands in several blocks and is mostly maintained by local clubs. Harvest was being conducted right up to the trail, but hikers have become accustomed to such multiple use. Logging brush is cleared from the trail daily.
Sale 600, Tract 4-10	Quick stop to inspect vernal pool near road and the buffer established during recent harvest. A large clearcut area was harvested during winter, but ground did not freeze well and logger did a nice job of using tops to build harvest trails, avoiding ruts.
Sale 616	An unplanned stop to view a recently completed harvest, where utilization of tops was not acceptable, requiring a return to the site. Although adjacent to a popular ski trail, the harvest was not especially clean, with high tops and some leaning saplings, but this is the local norm for such trails and users are used to such practices. The silvicultural result of the harvest was excellent, in a productive stand of red oak.
<b>Date:</b> August 10, 2012	
<b>FMU/Location/ sites visited</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
Lincoln County Offices, Merrill WI	Opening meeting: Introductions, audit protocols, review of field itinerary, questions and answers relating to audit standards.
<b>Participants, Opening meeting, field audit, Lincoln County:</b>	Mike Ferrucci, Auditor JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor Dave Capen, Auditor Kevin Kleinschmidt, Lincoln County Administrator Dean Bowie, Assistant County Administrator Bill Groth, DNR Liaison Forester Joe Schwantes, DNR, County Forest Specialist Chris Martin, DNR, Public and Private Lands Forester Mark Heyde, DNR, Forest Certification Coordinator Deidre Raimo, Observer, USFS Rick Weide, DNR Wildlife Biologist Curt Wilson, DNR District Forester

	<p>Mike Lietz, DNR Team Supervisor  Jane Severt, Executive Director, WCFA  Luke Nigon, Lincoln County Forester  Phil Theiler, Area Forestry Supervisor</p>
T001-10-1	<p>This site had an area of spruce that was thinned after some tornado damage in the spring of 2011. The goal is to keep this area in spruce habitat. Thinning was also done in a red and white pine stand. The long-term goal for the pine is to eventually convert them to aspen and hardwoods. There were several wetland inclusions on this site, protected by RMZs and filter strips.</p>
T004-11-1	<p>The harvest area included a 28-acre hardwood stand that was selectively harvested and a 26-acre aspen stand that was clearcut. Green tree retention in the aspen site was achieved primarily by prescription and also included an RMZ around a lake. There were also pockets of lowland forest that were left as retention because they were too wet to enter. A Single Track Mountain Bike Trail was present in the hardwood stand. The trail was constructed by a local bike club with the County's permission. The trail appeared to be constructed with best management practices for trail construction and no evidence of soil damage or erosion was found. There is a good working relationship between the clubs, the County and logging contractors.</p>
T010-10-1	<p>We stopped at this site that was harvested in the spring of 2011 because there was a small area of garlic mustard that had been identified on the site. The County had surrounded the garlic mustard with a snow fence to keep animals from spreading the seeds. They have also used a weed torch to kill the plants, have hand pulled plants and have applied herbicide to the site. The County has shown good efforts and plans to prevent the spread of invasive species.</p>
T011-12-1	<p>Ongoing selection harvest in a 23-acre northern hardwood stand. Rutting confined to short section of main stem of skidding road, with limited use of logging slash to prevent rutting (equipment was small, older forwarder and hand cutting, so it is challenging to move tops as needed). Foresters were attempting to make larger canopy gaps, with small gaps and some scarification attempted near hemlock trees. Sugar maple regeneration 3-10 foot tall is present in much of the understory, reflecting recent success in reducing the deer herd, but auditor did not observe taller, older maple regeneration despite past treatments here. Auditors interviewed the logger to confirm training and awareness of protocols required. Logger owns a one-man operation, uses chain saw, skidder/forwarder, and farm tractor with winch. Logger does not wear personal protective gear.</p>
T024-09-1	<p>This harvest unit included a 23-acre aspen clearcut and a 41-acre selective harvest in hardwoods. The site was harvested in the winter</p>

	of 2010, and the tops left on the landing were chipped for biomass in the spring of 2010. The landing, which is usually seeded by the County after harvest completion was not seeded. This was done to provide suitable roosting habitat for the American woodcock (although it was noted that it would be likely too small for that purpose). Green tree retention was left around wetland inclusions on the site.
Trapper Morrison Flowage	This flowage was established with an earthen dam built by DNR in cooperation with the County in the 1960's. It was created to provide wildlife habitat primarily fur bearers and waterfowl. This particular flowage has not met expectations for waterfowl habitat. However, it likely benefits many non-game wildlife species.
Lincoln County Offices, Merrill WI	Closing meeting: Auditors thanked CF and DNR personnel for their outstanding efforts during the audit process; closing of CARs from 2011; discussion of conformance with FSC standard; presentation of draft CARs and OBS from 2012 audit.
<b>Participants, Closing meeting, field audit, Lincoln County:</b>	<p>Mike Ferrucci, Auditor</p> <p>JoAnn Hanowski, Auditor</p> <p>Dave Capen, Auditor</p> <p>Darrell Zastrow, DNR Division of Forestry, Deputy Administrator</p> <p>Jill Nemec, Vilas County Liaison Forester</p> <p>Steve Jackson, Langlade County Forest Administrator</p> <p>Erik Rantala, Langlade County Forest Administrator</p> <p>Brad Ruesch, Taylor County Forest Administrator</p> <p>Russ Aszmann, Assistant Administrator, Taylor County</p> <p>Eric Holm, Price County Forest Administrator</p> <p>Larry Stevens, Vilas County Forest Administrator</p> <p>John Gagnon, Vilas County Assistant Administrator</p> <p>Kyle Schmidt, Price County Liaison Forester</p> <p>Kevin Kleinschmidt, Lincoln County Administrator</p> <p>Dean Bowie, Assistant County Administrator</p> <p>Bill Groth, DNR Liaison Forester</p> <p>Joe Schwantes, DNR, County Forest Specialist</p> <p>Chris Martin, DNR, Public and Private Lands Forester</p> <p>Mark Heyde, DNR, Forest Certification Coordinator</p> <p>Deidre Raimo, Observer, USFS</p> <p>Mike Lietz, DNR Team Supervisor</p> <p>Jane Severt, Executive Director, WCFA</p>

### 3.0 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

## 4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

### 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2011.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC US FM STD; 4.2.b
<b>Non-Conformity:</b> Review of timber sale contracts in Iron, Sawyer, and Washburn Counties did not show consistent inclusion of safety requirements. Although contracts contain training requirements, such as FISTA training, and the requirement to carry workman's compensation insurance, not all contracts specifically included safety requirements. For example, contracts in Sawyer and Washburn did not make specific reference to safety requirements or OSHA. Iron county have specific clauses requiring that contractors follow the OSHA Standard of Hazardous Communication regulations. However even in this case the contract specifically cites 29 CFR 1910.1200, which pertains to hazardous waste management, not the section of OSHA regulations covering logging operations (29 CFR 1910.266).	
<b>Corrective Action Request:</b> County Forests must ensure that contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	DNR staff reviewed current county contracts. County Forest Specialist sent directive to County Forest Administrators to include appropriate safety requirement language in contracts March 2012. Contracts were updated and copies returned to County Forest Specialist during Spring/Summer 2012.
<b>SCS review</b>	Timber sale contracts reviewed during the 2012 audit (except those awarded before revisions) contain appropriate language requiring contractors to comply with OSHA regulations for logging operations.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2011.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b> FSC US FM STD; 6.3.a.3	
<b>Non-Conformity:</b> Old growth definitions had not been updated to the new Type I and Type II definitions	

described in the FSC-US standard. However, this finding is only an observation, since a review of identified old-growth areas using the WisFIRS system did not result in any areas without management protections in place that would provide equivalent protection.	
<b>Corrective Action Request:</b> Old growth definitions and protection measures should be updated, in order to guard against the possibility that newly identified areas or changes in management practices do not lead to a non-conformance.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	Wisconsin DNR has an Old-Growth and Old Forest Handbook which contains several class definitions and management classes for old growth forests. The exact terminology is not identical to the FSC standard but there are synonymous classifications within this handbook – and the old growth lands are afforded equal protection. Type 1 old growth per the FSC definitions is 3+ acres that have never been logged and display old growth characteristics. Very few if any patches like this exist in the state of Wisconsin. Within the DNR old growth handbook these stands would be defined as “relict forest” and would consequently be in the “reserved” management class and therefore protected from disturbance. These stands would be documented by adding remarks in WisFIRS to ensure these stands are identified.
<b>SCS review</b>	The simple crosswalk presented in response to this OBS provides assurance that protection is afforded to Type I old-growth.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2011.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b> FSC US FM STD; 6.3.f	
<b>Non-Conformity:</b> Management plans have not been updated to include the definition of legacy trees, and the requirement that they not be harvested. Although interviews with DNR staff indicated that they were aware of the definition, and that a draft policy addressing the issue was being prepared, it was not yet in effect. In addition, interviews with field staff resulted in varying interpretations as to what constituted a legacy tree, indicating that there is still uncertainty about this new requirement.	
<b>Corrective Action Request:</b> Management plans, or other appropriate documents, must ensure that legacy trees, as defined by the FSC-US Forest Management Standard, are not harvested.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	The County Forest Specialist shared audit findings with Silviculture Specialist Team and requested a definition that satisfied FSC indicator 6.3.f. be included in the Silviculture handbook. A definition for “Legacy Tree” was

<i>evidence submitted)</i>	drafted by the Silviculture Specialist Team, based on the FSC definition, and included in the DNR Silviculture Handbook in Chapter 24 – Marking and Retention Guidelines. The revised Chapter 24, and additional chapter updates to Silviculture Handbook to be distributed to users. Following distribution, a newsletter article will highlight the new definition, will provide some additional descriptions/examples, will direct foresters to document any legacies in WisFIRS, and direct foresters to ensure that legacy trees are protected from harvest. Distribution is expected to occur in August or September 2012.
<b>SCS review</b>	Although the process of revising the Silviculture Handbook has not been completed at the time of the audit, field foresters were quite aware of definitions of legacy trees, as determined during field interviews.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2011.4</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b> FSC US FM STD; 8.3.a	
<p><b>Non-Conformity:</b> After the field portion of the audit, SCS received a complaint that county forests (Clark County in particular) had been selling FSC material without including the requisite information (Certificate code and FSC Claim), on trip tickets or other shipping documentation. In this particular case the code was included but the claim “FSC Pure” was not. In addition, FSC has recently updated the title of this product claim to “FSC 100%,” which will need to be used on chain-of-custody documentation beginning in October 2012.</p> <p>County forest program staff provided evidence that corrective actions had already been implemented regarding COC procedures, including the use of stamps containing the FSC claim on all trip tickets, and a standard letter sent from county forests to their wood purchasers, detailing the required information. However in this case the trip ticket in question did not contain the stamp, and the purchaser did not have a copy of the letter. Based on this, the finding has been lowered from a CAR to an observation, as corrective actions were already in effect, and a lapse in the system occurred.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request:</b> All County Forests selling FSC certified product must ensure that shipping documentation includes the appropriate FSC claim being made.</p>	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence)	Clark County forest program staff provided evidence that corrective actions had already been implemented regarding COC procedures, including the use of stamps containing the FSC claim on all trip tickets, and a standard letter sent from county

<i>submitted)</i>	forests to their wood purchasers, detailing the required information. In this case a single ticket had failed to be stamped. This was an isolated occurrence. All counties have received guidance to update their documentation to include the appropriate FSC claim and certificate numbers and those using up old tickets have provided documentation to receiving mills that wood coming from their County Forest can be considered certified.
<b>SCS review</b>	The proper action has been taken.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

#### 4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2012.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b>	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b><u>Deadline</u></b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b><u>FSC Indicator(s):</u></b>	FSC US 4.2.b
<b><u>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</u></b> Although contracts with logging contractors contain language requiring contractors to abide by OSHA regulations concerning job-site safety, county foresters and DNR foresters do not enforce compliance with these regulations upon observing unsafe practices, e.g., working without personal protective equipment. Two such instances were observed during the audit. Thus, there is a double standard—county and DNR employees do comply with requirements to wear protective equipment, but they do not always enforce the requirement for contractors or their employees to comply with these regulations.	
<b><u>Corrective Action Request (or Observation):</u></b> All County Forest employees and contractors must demonstrate a safe work environment.  The language of the CAR is directly from the standard (4.2.b): The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. The role of the auditor is to identify non-conformances to the standard, but not to dictate specific solutions. If County and DNR Foresters accomplish this through contacting the contractor rather than the contractor's employee directly, that is acceptable. However, from the evidence in the non-conformity section, it is not clear that this step was taken.	
<b><u>FME response</u></b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	

<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2012.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	FSC US 7.1.c
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Variation pertaining to the presentation and discussion of desired future conditions was found among county forests management plans reviewed during the audit. In one plan, the auditor could find no presentation of desired future conditions, only conditions predicted by current management direction. If found in more plans, this could present a future non-conformance.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): County Forests should be more explicit and/or more consistent in presenting desired future conditions in county forest plans and associated management activities to move the FMU toward the desired conditions.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2012.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	FSC US 7.2.a



**Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):** County forest managers are now directed to develop new comprehensive land use plans every 15 years by Wisconsin State Statute 28.11(5)(a), although the plans are living documents and updated frequently. Annual work plans follow the entry of new data from forest reconnaissance, and annual WisFIRS updates produce new 15-year harvest projections. However, an environmental assessment is only completed as part of the complete comprehensive land use plan revision.

The standard requires a full revision of the management plan at least every 10 years. Thus, there is a potential conflict between Wisconsin State Statutes directing DNR and County Forests to schedule plan revisions and the FSC Principles, Criteria, and Indicators.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):** Wisconsin's County Forests should examine the current process of plan revision and determine if the FSC requirement for a full revision of management plans every 10 years will be adequately addressed by 2016. Any proposed solution must ensure that management plans are reviewed on an ongoing basis and are updated whenever necessary to incorporate results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.

**FME response**  
*(including any  
evidence submitted)*

**SCS review**

**Status of CAR:**

- ☐ Closed  
☐ Upgraded to Major  
☐ Other decision (refer to description above)

## 5.0 STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

1. To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME's management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.
2. To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from the pre-evaluation (if one was conducted), lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

### 5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

None.	

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team's response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

## 5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------

## 6.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Comments:</b> The Wisconsin County Forest Program has done an excellent job of responding to revised FSC standards and previous corrective action requests. The decision to recommended continued certification was an easy one for the audit team. Auditors were impressed by close working relationships among county forests, local industry, and various user groups.	

## 7.0 CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE

☐ There were no changes in the scope of the certification in the previous year.

## Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Wisconsin DNR, County Forest Program		
Contact person	Joe Schwantes		
Address	101 S. Webster St. Madison, WI 53707	Telephone	608-264-9217
		Fax	608-266-8756
		e-mail	joseph.schwantes@wisconsin.gov
		Website	<a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/CountyForests/</a>

## FSC Sales Information

FSC salesperson			
Address		Telephone	
		Fax	
		e-mail	
		Website	

**Scope of Certificate**

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (if applicable)	19	
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate	19	
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude & Longitude:	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
privately managed		
state managed		
community managed	1,639,303 ac	
Number of FMUs in scope that are:		
less than 100 ha in area		100 - 1000 ha in area
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	4	more than 10 000 ha in area
		15
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area		
meet the eligibility criteria as low intensity SLIMF FMUs		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:		
FMU are individual County Forests which are further subdivided into compartments and stands..		

**Non-SLIMF Group Members**

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs	
Ashland	<a href="mailto:choffman05@centurytel.net">choffman05@centurytel.net</a>		
Barron	<a href="mailto:John.cisek@co.barron.wi.us">John.cisek@co.barron.wi.us</a>		
Bayfield	<a href="mailto:jbodine@bayfieldcounty.org">jbodine@bayfieldcounty.org</a>		
Chippewa	<a href="mailto:Mdahlby@co.chippewa.wi.us">Mdahlby@co.chippewa.wi.us</a>		
Clark	<a href="mailto:joshua.pedersen@co.clark.wi.us">joshua.pedersen@co.clark.wi.us</a>		
Douglas	<a href="mailto:jharris@douglascountywi.org">jharris@douglascountywi.org</a>		
Eau Claire	<a href="mailto:Mike.Torud@co.eau-claire.wi.us">Mike.Torud@co.eau-claire.wi.us</a>		
Florence	<a href="mailto:psmith@co.florence.wi.us">psmith@co.florence.wi.us</a>		
Forest	<a href="mailto:dzforestco@ez-net.com">dzforestco@ez-net.com</a>		
Iron	<a href="mailto:icfadmin@ironcountyforest.org">icfadmin@ironcountyforest.org</a>		
Jackson	<a href="mailto:jim.zahasky@centurytel.net">jim.zahasky@centurytel.net</a>		
Juneau	<a href="mailto:pfadm@co.juneau.wi.us">pfadm@co.juneau.wi.us</a>		

Lincoln	<a href="mailto:kkleinschmidt@co.lincoln.wi.us">kkleinschmidt@co.lincoln.wi.us</a>		
Oconto	<a href="mailto:robert.skalitzky@co.oconto.wi.us">robert.skalitzky@co.oconto.wi.us</a>		
Price	<a href="mailto:eric.holm@co.price.wi.us">eric.holm@co.price.wi.us</a>		
Sawyer	<a href="mailto:greg.peterson@sawyercountygov.org">greg.peterson@sawyercountygov.org</a>		
Taylor	<a href="mailto:brad.ruesch@co.taylor.wi.us">brad.ruesch@co.taylor.wi.us</a>		
Washburn	<a href="mailto:mlpeters@co.washburn.wi.us">mlpeters@co.washburn.wi.us</a>		
Wood	<a href="mailto:fschubert@co.wood.wi.us">fschubert@co.wood.wi.us</a>		

**Production Forests**

<b>Timber Forest Products</b>	<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	1,355,874
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	126,862
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	1,229,012
<b>Silvicultural system(s)</b>	<b>Area under type of management</b>
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range 1-174)	601,746
Shelterwood	157,624
Other:	173,663
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	225,959
Group selection	70,020
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	Acres 552 SCRUB OAK 1,139 JACK PINE 5,044 OAK 532 TAMARACK 11,953 NORTHERN HARDWOODS 4,184 RED PINE 2,518 SWAMP HARDWOODS 127 WHITE SPRUCE 330 SWAMP CONIFER 1,527 WHITE PINE 824 BLACK SPRUCE

	459 WHITE BIRCH 719 WHITE CEDAR 131 BOTTOMLAND HARDWOODS 828 RED MAPLE 11,676 ASPEN 13 CENTRAL HARDWOODS 14 MISCELLANEOUS CONIFEROUS 13 MISCELLANEOUS DECIDUOUS 93 HEMLOCK 205 BALSAM FIR 411 FIR SPRUCE Total: 43,292
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	Sphagnum moss- 20,000 bales annually (0391B sub-product)
<b>Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:</b>	
Data are derived from "WisFIRS" which is database that contains all recon, treatment, and timber sale data for State and County Lands. Sustainable rate of harvest is based on long term harvest goals (15yr avg.)	
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)</i></b>	
White pine, red pine, jack pine, spruce-fir, northern hardwoods, central hardwoods, oak, aspen and other merchantable species.	

**FSC Product Classification**

<b>Timber products</b>		
<b>Product Level 1</b>	<b>Product Level 2</b>	<b>Species</b>
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	11,636 MBF and 685,237 cds
W1 Rough Wood	W1.2 Fuel Wood	3,306 cds
W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood chips	<4" diameter, 7,108 cds and 12,803 tons
<b>Non-Timber Forest Products</b>		
<b>Product Level 1</b>	<b>Product Level 2</b>	<b>Product Level 3 and Species</b>
N6 Plants and plant parts	N6.1 Flowers	N6.3.1 Christmas trees
N6 Plants and plant parts	N6.2 Ferns, mosses and lichens	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.

**Conservation Areas**

Total Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives			ha or ac	
<b>High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas</b>				
<b>High Conservation Values present and respective areas:</b>			<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac	
	<b>Code</b>	<b>HCV Type</b>	<b>Description &amp; Location</b>	<b>Area</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Barrens-Eau Claire, Clark, Jackson Old Growth pine relics-Juneau, Talyor, Forest Oak Savanna- Clark, Washburn	2233
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	St. Croix River scenic easements (Natural Scenic River) Penokee Range-Iron Silent Wood Benchmark For.- Washburn	2713
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Assorted bogs, Wetland communities, hemlock areas, fens, kettle lakes- Several counties	36,020
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Migratory Bird Area-Clark Nemadji Floodplain forest-Douglas Potato River Falls-Iron	619
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).	Ruffed Grouse Mgmt. Areas-Wood, Washburn, Clark	2060
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
<b>Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'</b>				

**Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)**

<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.
<b>Explanation for exclusion of</b>	Twenty-nine counties in Wisconsin manage county forests. Each

FMUs and/or excision:	county decides independently whether to be certified by FSC.	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	Each timber sale is accompanied by documentation showing the forest of origin. Only counties in the certified program can make FSC claims.	
Description of FMUs excluded from or forested area excised from the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country)	Size ( <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac)
Any county not in the listed under the FSC certificate does not have FSC-certified FMUs.	Various locations, Wisconsin	

## 8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE

### 8.1 Social Information

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>		
<b>150 of male workers</b>	<b>30 of female workers</b>	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since last audit</b>	<b>Serious: 1</b>	<b>Fatal: 1</b>

### 8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

☐ FME does not use pesticides.

<b>Commercial name of pesticide/herbicide</b>	<b>Active ingredient</b>	<b>Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)</b>	<b>Size of area treated during previous year</b>	<b>Reason for use</b>
Round up	Glyphosate	5 gal	10 ac	Trail rehab and invasive plants
Oust	Sulfometuron Methyl	1 gal	1 ac	Invasive plants
Accord	Glyphosate	146 gallons	389 acres	Conifer release
Oust XP	Sulfometuron Methyl	24 lbs	389 acres	Conifer release
Entry	surfactant	30 gallons	389 acres	Conifer release
Forestry Garlon XRT	Triclopyr	10 gallons	65 acres	Conifer Release
Accord XRT	Glyphosate	70 gallons	186 acres	Site Prep
Chopper	Isopropylamine salt of Imazapyr	30 gallons	186 acres	Site Prep
Oust Extra	Sulfometuron Methyl	17 lbs	186 acres	Site Prep
Entree		15 gallons	186 acres	Site Prep
Cellu-treat		50 lbs	100 ac	Annossum

				treatment
Cellu-treat		100-150 lbs	80 ac	Annossum
Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	600 ounces	150 ac	Site prep
Accord	Glyphosate	150 quarts	150 ac	Site prep
Garlon 4	Triclopyr	22.5 quarts	12 ac	Barrens restoration
Tordon K	Picloram	72ounces	+/- 5 ac spot spray	Invasive control
Transline	Clopyralid	22ounces	+/- 5 ac spot pray	Invasive control
Plateau	Imazapic	25 ounces	+/- 5 ac spot	
Milestone	Aminoclyralid	15 oz	+/- 5 ac spot	
Cornerstone Plus	Glyphosate	5 gal	10ac	Spot weed control
Cornerstone Plus	Glyphosate	3% Solution-Spray to wet	20-25 acres	Garlic Mustard
Oust XP	Sulforeturon methyl	1 oz./ acre=9 acres	9 acres	Garlic Mustard
Garlon 4	Triclopyr	2% Solution-Spray to wet	1 acre	Garlic Mustard
Cellutreat	Disodium Octahorate	150 lbs	351 ac	Annossum
Killzall	Glyphosate	1 gallon	<1 ac	Grass/weed control
Element 4	Triclopyr	1 gallon	<1 ac	Stump treatment for invasive control
Spike 10 g	Tebuthiuron	50 gal	50 ac	Woody vegetation control in wildlife openings
Cornerstone plus	Glyphosate	195 oz.	5ac	Garlic Mustard



**SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)****Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation**

- ☐ FME consists of a single FMU
- ☒ FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

SCS staff establishes the design and level of sampling prior to each group or multiple FMU evaluation according to FSC-STD-20-007. A list of the FMUs sampled and the rationale behind their selection is listed below.

<b>FMU Name</b>	<b>FMU Size Category:</b> - SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	<b>Forest Type:</b> - Plantation - Natural Forest	<b>Rationale for Selection:</b> - Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access - Other – please describe
Lincoln County	Large > 10,000 ha	Natural Forest	Logistics: same region of state and time since last audit visit
Price County	Large > 10,000 ha	Natural Forest	Logistics: same region of state and time since last audit visit
Taylor County	Non SLIMF	Natural Forest	Logistics: same region of state and time since last audit visit
Wood County	Large > 10,000 ha	Natural Forest	Logistics: same region of state and time since last audit visit

**Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems**

The annual evaluation of management systems for the Wisconsin County Forest Program focused on four counties. Three counties were visited by a single auditor, and the fourth was visited by all three auditors. Management plans and numerous other guidance documents for all four counties were examined, either before or during the audit, and forest administrators were questioned about selected elements of their management plans. Interviews with forest management staff in all counties were conducted during meetings in county offices and during day-long field visits to sites selected before the audit by the Lead Auditor. Additional interviews were conducted with contract workers, on their job site. All three auditors conducted similar interviews, but focused on different elements of the certification standard. During field visits, auditors evaluated management actions against county management plans and certification standards. Conformance or non-conformance with selected elements of the standard was determined in confidential deliberations, based on objective information gathered during the audit process.

### Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

#### List of FME Staff Consulted

Numerous state and county employees associated with management of County Forests were consulted during the surveillance audit. Names and positions are included in Section 2.1, Audit Itinerary. All but a few were interviewed directly in meetings or during field visits. A few individuals participated only by telephone.

#### List of other Stakeholders Consulted

No other stakeholders were consulted. Two foresters who worked for logging contractors participated in the field audit in Wood County; their role was to answer questions about harvest operations on selected field visits.

### Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

No additional audit techniques were employed.

### Appendix 5 – Pesticide Derogations

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.		
Name of pesticide/ herbicide (active ingredient)		Date derogation approved
Condition	Conformance (C/ NC)	Evidence of progress

### Appendix 6 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation Year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2009	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2010	P.1 and P.2
2011	Criteria 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.5, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.9, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, and 9.4
2012	P.5. and P.7; Criteria 1.5, 2.1, 2.3, 3.2, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.9, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 9.3, 9.4,
2013	

*C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator*

*NC= Non-Conformance with Criterion or Indicator*

*NA = Not Applicable*

*NE = Not Evaluated*

REQUIREMENT	C/ NC	COMMENT/CAR
-------------	-------	-------------

<b>P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.</b>		
<b>C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</b>	C	
1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the <b>Forest Management Unit</b> (FMU).	C	County Forest Administrators interviewed during the audit described numerous measures to prevent unauthorized activities. Chief among these are programs for maintaining visible property boundaries and signs in appropriate locations.
1.5.b. If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources.	C	Remote cameras have been employed in several instances during the past years. County sheriff personnel and DNR wardens provide assistance, when appropriate. Two forest administrators described programs to clean up illegal dumping.
<b>P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</b>		
<b>C2.1. Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.</b>	C	Each CF management plan presents the legal authorities for the ownership and management of county forests.
<b>C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</b>	C	
2.3.a. If <b>disputes</b> arise regarding tenure claims or use rights then the forest owner or manager initially attempts to resolve them through open communication, negotiation, and/or mediation. If these good-faith efforts fail, then federal, state, and/or local laws are employed to resolve such disputes.	C	Several past disputes of use rights were described by forest administrators during the audit, and all have been addressed in appropriate ways, with legal proceedings as the last resort.
2.3.b. The forest owner or manager documents any significant disputes over tenure and use rights.	C	No new disputes were reported in response to a request for such information.
<b>P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</b>		
<b>C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources</b>		

<b>or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b>	C	
3.2.a. During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.	C	Especially in Wisconsin, with eleven American Indian tribes, county forest administrators, in cooperation with DNR, have clearly established legal rights and communicate regularly with tribal representatives. No disputes were report in response to a request to the counties for such information.
3.2.b. Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan.	C	A review of four county management plans found appropriate mention of measures for protecting tribal resources.
<b>C3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.</b>	NA	
3.4.c. The forest owner or manager respects the confidentiality of tribal traditional knowledge and assists in the protection of such knowledge.	NA	FME does not use protected traditional tribal knowledge.
<b>P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</b>		
<b>C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</b>	C	
4.2.a. The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).	C	County forests are managed by public employees, both county and state, thus assuring compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Offices where county foresters work have safety and health measures conspicuously displayed in offices.
4.2.b. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.	NC	Although contracts with logging contractors contain language requiring contractors to abide by OSHA regulations concerning job-site safety, county foresters and DNR foresters do not enforce compliance with these regulations upon observing unsafe practices, e.g., working without personal protective equipment. Two such instances were observed during the audit. Thus, there is a double standard—county and DNR employees do comply with requirements to wear protective equipment but do not always enforce the requirement for contractors or their employees to comply with these regulations. See CAR 2012.1.
4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the		Service providers are well trained and qualified. Logging contractors and their employees have, for the most part,

management plan.	C	completed training that includes safety, and many hold certificates as master loggers.
<b>C4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.</b>	C	
<p>4.4.a. The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU);</li> <li>• Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting);</li> <li>• Aesthetics;</li> <li>• Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health;</li> <li>• Community economic opportunities;</li> <li>• Other people who may be affected by management operations.</li> </ul> <p>A summary is available to the CB.</p>	C	County forests are managed in close cooperation with the public (e.g., Forestry Committees in each county). Discussions with county and state officials (DNR liaison foresters) during the audit frequently revealed the incorporation of social impacts into management planning and operations. No concise written summary of social impacts is available from county to county, but various summary documents were presented to auditors upon request.
4.4.b. The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.	C	See 7.1.j. A process for requesting public input and responding is an integral part of developing the management plans.
4.4.c. People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.	C	It is standard procedure to notify adjacent landowners, especially private owners, before any harvest-related operations commence. Form 2460, for pre-harvest assessment, has a check-off for such notification.
<p>4.4.d. For <b>public forests</b>, consultation shall include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans;</li> <li>2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management;</li> <li>3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available.</li> </ol>	C	<p>County board meetings and forestry committee meetings in which policies for resource management and work plans are set allow for public input. County Forest administrators are readily accessible to the public, facilitating the evaluation of social impacts. A summary of stakeholder comments from selected counties was provided to the auditors:</p> <p>Clark County – 1) harvesting timber at Levis Mound Rec Area, 2) termination of cabin permits, 3) deer processing in Snyder Park, 4) Hogies ATV trail management, 5) request to modify county forest access plan.</p> <p>Juneau County – ATV groups requesting access onto county</p>

Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public.		<p>forest for trails and playground.</p> <p>Washburn County – 1) Complaint over road closure, 2) Complaint over trail/road closure – resolved through issuing disabled permits.</p> <p>CF administrators routinely respond to such comments and/or take them to their respective forestry committees, comprised of members of the public.</p>
<b>P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</b>		
<b>C5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.</b>	C	
5.1.a. The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.	C	County forests generally have a solid foundation for finances. In most counties, revenues from timber sales go into the general fund and then county boards allocate annual budgets to forestry and recreation programs. In addition, DNR makes a substantial contribution to the counties, both in direct funding and by allocating time of Liaison Foresters. Other expertise provided by DNR includes wildlife and fisheries biologists and ecologists from Bureau of Endangered Resources.
5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.	C	Recent cuts have been made to DNR’s support of County Forestry (e.g., \$0.10 per acre funds have been reduced to \$0.05 per acre), and DNR staff time allocations have been reduced as a result of many vacant positions in DNR. County Forests and DNR have faced financial challenges related to the current difficult financial climate, which can impact funding at all levels of government. Despite recent challenges, , DNR has now advertised for and/or hired 30 new foresters, so positions are gradually being filled. These changes do not seem to have resulted in any inability to implement management plans, but monitoring during annual audits should continue.
<b>C5.2. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.</b>	C	
5.2.a. Where forest products are harvested or sold, opportunities for forest product sales and services are given to local harvesters, value-added processing and manufacturing facilities, guiding services, and other operations that are able to offer services at competitive rates and levels of service.	C	Although almost all sales are required to be advertised for bid, county forests routinely mark sales that vary in size, with the explicit purpose of favoring small contractors, who are often local. Contractors interviewed during field audits were mostly from the immediate area. Even the larger contractors were employing local crews.
5.2.b. The forest owner or manager takes measures to optimize the use of harvested forest products and		Field inspections revealed careful oversight of utilization, including one example in Lincoln county where an operator

explores product diversification where appropriate and consistent with management objectives.	C	was called back to a site to utilize more limb-wood from red oak. In northern Wisconsin, the site of the 2012 audit, diverse markets are available for a variety of forest products.
5.2.c. On public lands where forest products are harvested and sold, some sales of forest products or contracts are scaled or structured to allow small business to bid competitively.	C	See 5.2.a.
<b>C5.3. Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</b>	C	
5.3.a. Management practices are employed to minimize the loss and/or waste of harvested forest products.	C	As described above, CF foresters are careful not to allow waste during harvest operations. Despite the practice of selling harvests by bid, the county is paid based on mill tally, an incentive to minimize waste.
5.3.b. Harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>soil compaction, <b>rutting</b> and erosion are minimized;</li> <li>residual trees are not significantly damaged to the extent that health, growth, or values are noticeably affected;</li> <li>damage to NTFPs is minimized during management activities; and</li> <li>techniques and equipment that minimize impacts to vegetation, soil, and water are used whenever feasible.</li> </ul>	C	County foresters and DNR foresters in Wisconsin show an uncommon level of regard for protecting resources on harvest site. DNR cooperators, led by a trained hydrologist, have set standards—adopted by many—for minimizing rutting and soil compaction. Their standards were evident during field audits on county forests. Almost all harvesting is done by processors and forwarded, generally regarded as the most resource-friendly harvesting option. The incidence of damaged trees in active and recently harvest sites was quite low.
<b>C5.4. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</b>	C	
5.4.a. The forest owner or manager demonstrates knowledge of their operation's effect on the local economy as it relates to existing and potential markets for a wide variety of timber and non-timber forest products and services.	C	Northern Wisconsin illustrates very close local synergies between the forest industry (many counties have one or more large processing operations) and county management of their forests. Local people see county forests as an important contributor to these mills and thus to local employment. Management planning clearly reflects the importance of forest products to local industries, e.g., different products, both traditional and non-traditional.
5.4.b The forest owner or manager strives to diversify the economic use of the forest according to Indicator 5.4.a.	C	Economic diversity is seen by county forests visited in this audit as a product of good forest management, endeavoring to manage species appropriate to the site. Thus, it would be expected that a diversity of species would be available for harvest. In the counties audited, there was no evidence that county forests were being managed with a bias for any local

		product demand.
<b>C5.5. Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and, where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources such as watersheds and fisheries.</b>	C	
5.5.a. In developing and implementing activities on the FMU, the forest owner or manager identifies, defines and implements appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing forest services and resources that serve public values, including municipal watersheds, fisheries, carbon storage and sequestration, recreation and tourism.	C	As public forests, CF management is strongly oriented toward a diversity of public values. Recreation, in particular, is a top priority, with forests providing a variety of trails: hiking, mountain biking, ATV, snowmobile, horse-back riding. County forests also develop and maintain camping areas. Hunting is “big business” in northern Wisconsin, and county forests consider habitat for featured species, e.g., ruffed grouse, and for hunter access. Close working relationships with DNR wildlife and fisheries biologists are additional indicators on conformance.
5.5.b The forest owner or manager uses the information from Indicator 5.5.a to implement appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing these services and resources.	C	Refer to 5.5.a.
<b>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</b>	C	
<p>5.6.a. In FMUs where products are being harvested, the landowner or manager calculates the sustained yield harvest level for each sustained yield planning unit, and provides clear rationale for determining the size and layout of the planning unit. The sustained yield harvest level calculation is documented in the Management Plan.</p> <p>The sustained yield harvest level calculation for each planning unit is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• documented growth rates for particular sites, and/or acreage of forest types, age-classes and species distributions;</li> <li>• mortality and decay and other factors that affect net growth;</li> <li>• areas reserved from harvest or subject to harvest restrictions to meet other management goals;</li> <li>• silvicultural practices that will be employed on the FMU;</li> <li>• management objectives and desired future conditions.</li> </ul>	C	<p>Although CF management plans do not present details of the method of allowable harvest calculation, they do refer to the Public Forest Lands Handbook, where most of this information is available. Harvest levels are produced for each county, in cooperation with DNR, from WisFIRS. Sustained yields are determined by area, not by volume, and are presented in the management plan, with annual updates.</p> <p>Growth and regeneration data, site index models, soil classification, and desired future condition all factor into determining when a given stand will be harvested.</p>



The calculation is made by considering the effects of repeated prescribed harvests on the product/species and its ecosystem, as well as planned management treatments and projections of subsequent regrowth beyond single rotation and multiple re-entries.		
5.6.b. Average annual harvest levels, over rolling periods of no more than 10 years, do not exceed the calculated sustained yield harvest level.	C	In 2011, 40,463 acres were established for sale across the county forest system. This compares with 43,292 acres, the calculated average harvest goal for a 15-year period. Data provided to the CB in 2009, indicated that the basic calculation of AAH was 61,000 acres, but that numerous constraints reduced the effective figure to 43,400 acres. Some counties are harvesting below their allowable levels, but others (e.g., Wood County) are somewhat above allowable in order to balance age classes or address backlogs.
5.6.c. Rates and methods of timber harvest lead to achieving desired conditions, and improve or maintain health and quality across the FMU. Overstocked stands and stands that have been depleted or rendered to be below productive potential due to natural events, past management, or lack of management, are returned to desired stocking levels and composition at the earliest practicable time as justified in management objectives.	C	WisFIRS was designed to do exactly what is described by this indicator. Forest recon and other sources of annual updates inform the adaptive harvest scheduling, modifying desired conditions on the FMU as appropriate for changing conditions.
5.6.d. For NTFPs, calculation of quantitative sustained yield harvest levels is required only in cases where products are harvested in significant commercial operations or where traditional or customary use rights may be impacted by such harvests. In other situations, the forest owner or manager utilizes available information, and new information that can be reasonably gathered, to set harvesting levels that will not result in a depletion of the non-timber growing stocks or other adverse effects to the forest ecosystem.	C	County forest administrators did not report any examples of NTFPs being harvested in commercial quantities. Small-quantities of firewood for home use may be taken by the public, but permits are required and recorded.
<b>P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</b>		
<b>C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</b>	C	
6.2.a. If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey		County foresters, in cooperation with numerous experts in DNR, identify the likely presence of RTE species in three steps:

to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present.  Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.	C	(1) a listing of known species at the time of the comprehensive management plan, (2) at annual interdisciplinary meetings where harvest plans are reviewed, and (3) at the pre-harvest (Form 2460) assessment and prescription, where endangered resources ecologists would contribute if there were evidence of a listed species. At all steps, the Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) database is consulted.
6.2.b. When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. <b>Conservation zones</b> and/or <b>protected areas</b> are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.	C	The interdisciplinary approach to protected RTE species and their habitat described above, 6.2.a, assures that appropriate conservation measures are taken. A number of such examples were seen on field audits: wood turtles, red-shouldered hawks, two threatened plant species. Conservation zones also are established for certain species, such as Kirtland's warbler.
6.2.c. For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.	C	County forests engage in management to meet the recovery goals of threatened species, just as would be expected in state forest lands. Examples mentioned during audit: golden-winged warbler (young forest) and Kirtland's warbler (jack pine forest).
6.2.d. Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).	C	Again, close cooperation with DNR assures the control of hunting, fishing, and trapping in the context of this indicator. However, some county foresters have expressed concern about DNR's management of the white-tailed deer population at densities that threaten the natural reproduction of some forest communities.
<b>C6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including:</b> <b>a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</b>	C	
<b>C6.3.a. Landscape-scale indicators</b>	C	
6.3.a.1. The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented		Counties visited in 2012 have active management plans to maintain and restore hemlock and pine habitats. The

<p><b>successional</b> stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.</p>	C	<p>Counties are participating with the USFWS to shear decadent alder habitat to provide early successional habitat for wildlife species (e.g., American woodcock and golden-winged warbler).</p>
<p>6.3.a.2. When a <b>rare ecological community</b> is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, <b>conservation zones</b> and/or <b>protected areas</b> are established where warranted.</p>	C	<p>If a rare ecological community is present on a county forest, it would be identified in the NHI database. This database is searched for rare elements in the planning of management activities on county forests. If an NHI hit is found, an appropriate biologist/ecologist is consulted and the site is protected as appropriate, usually by buffers or by limiting harvest to the winter season.</p>
<p>6.3.a.3. When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all <b>Type 1</b> and <b>Type 2 old growth</b>. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values.</p> <p>Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g).</p> <p>On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in</p>	NA	<p>Counties visited in 2012 did not have any Type 1 or Type 2 old growth on county forests. Instance were observed where old growth was found on nearby state lands or federal lands managed by USFS.</p>

<p>recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership.</li> <li>2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists.</li> <li>3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained.</li> <li>4. Old-growth structures are maintained.</li> <li>5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established.</li> <li>6. Landscape level considerations are addressed.</li> <li>7. Rare species are protected.</li> </ol>		
<p>6.3.b. To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p>	C	<p>County forests management plan goals are ecologically oriented and management is conducted to maintain ecological habitat conditions that are suited to each site. These decisions are aided by the habitat classification that is done in the reconnaissance inventory for each site. County forests visited in 2012 are likely to allow natural regeneration and succession to occur on the site. For example, old pine plantations will be allowed to succeed to hardwoods where natural regeneration allows.</p>
<p>6.3.c. Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of <b>Riparian Management Zones (RMZs)</b> to provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands;</li> <li>b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent <b>aquatic habitats</b>;</li> <li>c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel;</li> <li>d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and,</li> <li>e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem.</li> </ol>	C	<p>Revisions to the Wisconsin Best Management Practices For Water Quality took effect in January 2011; these specify additional protection for all wetlands, particularly seasonal wetlands, many of which are small but some of which are ecologically significant; foresters and loggers are aware of these provisions and work to implement them.</p> <p>Water quality considerations including lakes or rivers potentially affected by the harvest are documented for each proposed harvest on a Form 2460, "Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report" and this information is reflected in the harvesting requirements within the timber sale contracts.</p> <p>Sale and/or harvest unit boundaries are designed to avoid or buffer wetlands, stream, lakes, and other water bodies. Riparian buffers associated with harvests are shown on maps and marked on the ground. Confirmed by field observations that non-forested wetlands are protected by excluding them from sales where possible, and by buffering them using special colors of paint to indicate "no harvest" or "no equipment," or by not marking any trees for harvest. Very small non-forested wetlands are generally protected; loggers try to avoid these, and foresters work to communicate their locations, but some are entered on occasion. Many sites with significant areas of included wetlands (forested and/or non-</p>

		<p>forested) are designated for winter harvest only.</p> <p>Confirmed from field audits from all four counties visited that foresters are knowledgeable of the BMP requirements to protect these wetland elements and are doing an excellent job of implementing them on harvest sites.</p>
<p><b>Stand-scale Indicators</b></p> <p>6.3.d Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p>	C	<p>County forest management plans and pre-harvest assessments clearly reflect an emphasis on importance of site conditions and naturally occurring species. Foresters are well aware of growing the right species for the right sites.</p>
<p>6.3.e. When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. <b>Native species</b> suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>	C	<p>Counties regularly buy trees from the state nurseries. Price County foresters indicated that prices from Canadian nurseries are often less expensive than from state nurseries, but they have not ordered from other nurseries and were encouraged to check on the provenance of the seedlings before doing so. As far as the auditors could determine, no counties are planting non-native species.</p>
<p>6.3.f. Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <p>a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, <b>snags</b>, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. <b>Legacy trees</b> where present are not harvested; and</p> <p>b) vertical and horizontal complexity.</p> <p>Trees selected for <b>retention</b> are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	C	<p>County personnel employ statewide silvicultural guidelines for retaining structural diversity in even-aged management systems. County personnel attended training to gain understanding and application of the new green tree retention standards. Based on recent revisions to the marking and retention chapter in the Silviculture Handbook, foresters are marking more leave trees (individual) and painting off more pockets or clumps of leave trees, especially around wetlands. We saw this particularly well in aspen clearcuts that were visited in Lincoln, Price and Langlade Counties.</p> <p>The definition of Legacy trees is working its way into the silviculture handbook, but Lincoln and Price County foresters claim to have been protecting legacy trees for many years. The new provisions, which are in use already, require that legacy trees be described in the 2460 narrative and then indicated on the GIS (WisFIRs). Two types of legacy trees mentioned as relevant in the timber types of the Newwood and Harrison blocks (rolling terrain, mixed species stands) are large white pine, often found within northern hardwood stands, and large red oak, often found in oak/hardwood/conifer stands.</p>
<p>6.3.g.1 In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when <b>even-aged systems</b> are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as</p>	C	<p>County foresters routinely retain green trees in a harvest by prescription and by marking wildlife trees. In addition, native vegetation is retained in riparian buffers and in retention islands. In Price County, the foresters did not retain green trees in a spruce stand that was salvaged harvested. Rational</p>

<p>described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>		<p>for departure from the green retention guidelines were documented in notes.</p>
<p>6.3.g.2 Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture).</li> <li>2. Is based on the totality of the <b>best available information</b> including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU.</li> <li>3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas.</li> <li>4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species.</li> <li>5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.</li> </ol>	NA	<p>There are no opening size limits for the Lake States-Central Hardwood region.</p>
<p>6.3.h. The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control <b>invasive species</b>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems;</li> <li>2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive</li> </ol>	C	<p>All counties visited in 2012 have strong programs to limit the introduction and spread of exotic plants. In Vilas County, logging equipment is cleaned before harvest is initiated, staff are trained on invasive species, surveys were completed for honeysuckle on trails. Oneida County requires that machinery must be sanitized prior to entering/leaving sale if invasives are present. Lincoln and Price Counties have active programs to prevent the spread of garlic mustard and buckthorn (demonstrated on a field site in Lincoln where the mustard</p>

<p>establishment, growth, and spread;</p> <p>3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible; and,</p> <p>4. monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.</p>		<p>was surrounded by a snow fence) and also have a GIS layer showing known locations of invasive plants. Counties monitor the effectiveness of their control measures and routinely make changes to methodology to control invasive species.</p>
<p>6.3.i. In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4) public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.</p>	C	<p>Counties use prescribed fire in wildlife management work to maintain open habitat characteristics of lowland and upland habitat. Prescribed fires are planned and controlled to meet safety and risk requirements. Beyond controlled fires, county foresters are often trained fire fighters and cooperate with DNR in preventing and controlling wildfires.</p>
<p><b>C6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</b></p>	C	
<p>6.4.a. The forest owner or manager documents the ecosystems that would naturally exist on the FMU, and assesses the adequacy of their representation and protection in the <b>landscape</b> (see Criterion 7.1). The assessment for medium and large forests include some or all of the following: a) <b>GAP analyses</b>; b) collaboration with state natural heritage programs and other public agencies; c) regional, landscape, and watershed planning efforts; d) collaboration with universities and/or local conservation groups.</p> <p>For an area that is not located on the FMU to qualify as a Representative Sample Area (RSA), it should be under permanent protection in its natural state.</p>	C	<p>Wisconsin Counties rely on information generated by DNR that has documented ecosystems that occurred naturally across the landscape, through a classic gap analysis of representativeness. The State's Natural Area program has documented locations of native ecosystems and has protected many of these sites as SNAs. The counties visited in 2012 have several protected SNAs that were identified by the state and are protected by the counties.</p>
<p>6.4.b. Where existing areas within the landscape, but external to the FMU, are not of adequate protection, size, and configuration to serve as representative samples of existing ecosystems, forest owners or managers, whose properties are conducive to the establishment of such areas, designate ecologically viable RSAs to serve these purposes.</p> <p>Large FMUs are generally expected to establish RSAs of purpose 2 and 3 within the FMU.</p>	C	<p>The SNA program has identified gaps in the portfolio of protected areas, and sites that they would like in the program. When sites are identified as future SNAs they go through an evaluation process (usually a biotic inventory) and are then ranked as to their uniqueness in representation of the representative sample ecosystem. County forests collaborate with DNR in this process.</p>
<p>6.4.c. Management activities within RSAs are limited to low impact activities compatible with the protected RSA objectives, except under the following circumstances:</p>		<p>SNAs are not exclusively passive management. County management plans where SNAs are present document the management activities that will be allowed on individual SNAs. Some examples of management on SNAs include the</p>

<p>a) harvesting activities only where they are necessary to restore or create conditions to meet the objectives of the protected RSA, or to mitigate conditions that interfere with achieving the RSA objectives; or</p> <p>b) road-building only where it is documented that it will contribute to minimizing the overall environmental impacts within the FMU and will not jeopardize the purpose for which the RSA was designated.</p>	C	<p>use of fire to retain open habitat conditions of some wetland types. The SNA website outlines management activities that are allowed on SNAs (<a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/sna/napc.htm">http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/er/sna/napc.htm</a>).</p>
<p>6.4.d. The RSA assessment (Indicator 6.4.a) shall be periodically reviewed and if necessary updated (at a minimum every 10 years) in order to determine if the need for RSAs has changed; the designation of RSAs (Indicator 6.4.b is revised accordingly.</p>	C	<p>Established in 1985 by the Wisconsin legislature, Wisconsin's Natural Heritage Inventory program (NHI) is part of an international network of inventory programs. The program is responsible for maintaining data on the locations and status of rare species, natural communities, and natural features throughout the state. Species and natural communities tracked by the NHI Program can be found on the NHI Working List. New locations of rare species and communities are entered into the NHI database as they are found. Separately, the SNA program is a cooperative effort involving a number of experts outside of DNR; the program is dynamic, thus periodic reviews are ongoing.</p>
<p>6.4.e. Managers of large, contiguous public forests establish and maintain a network of representative protected areas sufficient in size to maintain species dependent on interior core habitats.</p>	C	<p>Where possible, the SNA program identifies the largest stands and or blocks of representative ecosystems that are present on the landscape. Wisconsin has a program to identify and protect LSNA (Landscape Scale Natural Areas) which are required to be 640 acres in size.</p>
<p><b>C6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</b></p>	C	
<p>6.6.a. No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents).</p>	C	<p>The list of chemicals used on county forest lands in the last audit year includes no products on the FSC list.</p>
<p>6.6.b. All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides are used only</p>		<p>Chemical treatments in 2012 were reported by only 11 of 19 counties. In the counties audited, chemicals were used sparingly and only for treatment of an invasive plant (Lincoln</p>



<p>when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical.</p> <p>Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy. The written strategy shall include an analysis of options for, and the effects of, various chemical and non-chemical pest control strategies, with the goal of reducing or eliminating chemical use.</p>	C	<p>county, garlic mustard) and for weed control on less than an acre (Price county). Chemical use must be approved by the County Forest Administrator; written plans are required for extensive use.</p>
<p>6.6.c. Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.</p>	C	<p>The only applications in counties visited in 2012 were minor and thus a limited number of decisions to be made regarding risk. All applications were by personnel with pesticide application training and certificates.</p>
<p>6.6.d. Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area.</p> <p>Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.</p>	C	<p>Written prescriptions are the rule whenever chemicals are used for silvicultural purposes. When used for control of invasive species, a written plan is prepared except in instances where treatment is for a small area, in which case the Invasive Species Handbook is followed, i.e., a blanket prescription.</p>
<p>6.6.e. If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.</p>	C	<p>Monitoring and adaptive management was clearly demonstrated in Lincoln County, where auditors inspected control sites for garlic mustard. Likewise, this county provided records as required. No other opportunities for inspecting monitoring procedures were available during the audit.</p>
<p><b>C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse</b></p>	C	

<b>ecological impacts.</b>		
6.9.a. The use of <b>exotic species</b> is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.	C	No evidence of the use of exotic species for management or commercial purposes was present during the audit. Where planting is done, county foresters are aware of the value of using stock grown in local nurseries from local seed sources.
6.9.b. If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.	C	NA
6.9.c. The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species	C	NA
<b>P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</b>		
<b>C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide:</b>  <b>a) Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands.</b>  <b>c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species.</b>  <b>h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership.</b>  <b>i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</b>	C	Management plans for county forests (CF) in Wisconsin are unique in that they are developed in close cooperation with DNR. The current version of county plans was written at about the same time (2006) and all have a format that is virtually identical, with editing as necessary to insert information relevant to each county. Each county, however, conducted its own environmental assessment, and each county does periodic updates including annual work plans. Thus, assessment of the indicators below is unusually consistent among counties. Four counties comprised the 2012 FSC surveillance audit; plan for all four counties were examined, but specific references in the descriptions of conformance that follow are for the Lincoln County Plan. Other plans are mentioned only where significant differences in content were revealed.
7.1.a. The management plan identifies the ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others.	C	CF management plans cite Wisconsin Statutes 28.10, the legislation that establishes the authority for establishment of, administration of, and management of county forests.
7.1.b. The management plan describes the history of		CF management plans describe the history of the forest in

land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a).	C	each county, the natural features of the forest, and the relevant biological communities and associated resources (Chapter 130). Current forest types and age classes are presented in Chapter 800, a series of appendices.
7.1.c. The management plan describes:  a) current conditions of the timber and non-timber forest resources being managed; b) desired future conditions; c) historical ecological conditions; and d) applicable management objectives and activities to move the FMU toward desired future conditions.	C	CF management plans are complemented by the Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines (WFMG), published by DNR and revised in 2011. This document presents an excellent history of forest conditions and natural disturbance regimes. Whereas management objectives are clearly presented in CF plans, and future conditions are projected by WisFIRS models, auditors found variation among plans in the presentation of desired future conditions. <b>See OBS 2012.2</b>
7.1.d. The management plan includes a description of the landscape within which the FMU is located and describes how landscape-scale habitat elements described in Criterion 6.3 will be addressed.	C	CF management plans describe the landscape of each county in Chapter 100 and are also complemented by a narrative (Form 2460) prepared for all timber sales. To varying degrees, examples of Form 2460 examined during the audit had relevant descriptions of the surrounding landscape.
7.1.e. The management plan includes a description of the following resources and outlines activities to conserve and/or protect:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rare, threatened, or endangered species and natural communities (see Criterion 6.2);</li> <li>• plant species and community diversity and wildlife habitats (see Criterion 6.3);</li> <li>• water resources (see Criterion 6.5);</li> <li>• soil resources (see Criterion 6.3);</li> <li>• Representative Sample Areas (see Criterion 6.4);</li> <li>• High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9);</li> <li>• Other special management areas.</li> </ul>	C	CF plans include all of the elements listed in this indicator. Some items found in the comprehensive plan were outdated, such as list of threatened and endangered species, but more relevant documents, such as Form 2460 and revisions to the appendices of the plan contained up-to-date lists. Each plan reviewed clearly identified HCVF, protected and managed in cooperation with the State Natural Areas Program.
7.1.f. If invasive species are present, the management plan describes invasive species conditions, applicable management objectives, and how they will be controlled (see Indicator 6.3.j).	C	Chapter 830 of CF plans includes lists and management recommendations for invasive species. This is strongly supplemented by an Invasive Species Handbook prepared by DNR and numerous cooperators. Invasive species are also addressed on Form 2460, prior to timber sales.
7.1.g. The management plan describes insects and diseases, current or anticipated outbreaks on forest conditions and management goals, and how insects and diseases will be managed (see Criteria 6.6 and 6.8).	C	Chapter 610 of CF plans addresses control of forest pests and pathogens. More importantly, DNR foresters working as liaisons with county forests are well-connected with a substantial resource of forest pest specialists within DNR, the state, and region.
7.1.h. If chemicals are used, the plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.6.	C	County forests use chemicals sparingly, especially for silviculture, and CF management plans don't address their use in detail. Chapter 14 in the WFMG does address pesticide use. But more importantly, a specific plan is required for each

		application, approved by the County Forest Administrator.
7.1.i. If biological controls are used, the management plan describes what is being used, applications, and how the management system conforms with Criterion 6.8.	C	Similar to chemical use, CF plans include general reference to biological controls, if any. Again, a specific plan would be approved, likely requiring an environmental assessment.
7.1.j. The management plan incorporates the results of the evaluation of social impacts, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traditional cultural resources and rights of use (see Criterion 2.1);</li> <li>• potential conflicts with customary uses and use rights (see Criteria 2.2, 2.3, 3.2);</li> <li>• management of ceremonial, archeological, and historic sites (see Criteria 3.3 and 4.5);</li> <li>• management of aesthetic values (see Indicator 4.4.a);</li> <li>• public access to and use of the forest, and other recreation issues;</li> <li>• local and regional socioeconomic conditions and economic opportunities, including creation and/or maintenance of quality jobs (see Indicators 4.1.b and 4.4.a), local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e), and participation in local development opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g).</li> </ul>	C	County forests are managed in close cooperation with the local public, demonstrating numerous examples of projects developed in cooperation with local interest groups. Such social impacts are presented mostly in Chapter 500 of the comprehensive plans, which includes sections on treaty rights and cultural features. Additional information is found in Chapter 700, Roads and Trails, and appendices in Chapters 800 and 900.
7.1.k. The management plan describes the general purpose, condition and maintenance needs of the transportation network (see Indicator 6.5.e).	C	CF plans address the transportation network in Chapters 700 and 1000 (Needs), but just as importantly in annual work plans.
7.1.l. The management plan describes the silvicultural and other management systems used and how they will sustain, over the long term, forest ecosystems present on the FMU.	C	General references are contained in Chapter 800, Integrated Resource Management, but the Silviculture Handbook is the primary reference for this element of the plan. Specific silviculture plans are part of Form 2460.
7.1.m. The management plan describes how species selection and harvest rate calculations were developed to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.	C	The degree to which harvest rate calculations were presented in Chapter 800 of CF plans varied among counties, but the Public Lands Handbook is the primary reference for harvest rate calculations. Species selection for harvest is a product of annual updates from forest recon and the programming of the WisFIRS system.
7.1.n. The management plan includes a description of monitoring procedures necessary to address the requirements of Criterion 8.2.	C	Most of the required monitoring is part of the forest compartment reconnaissance (recon), described in detail in the Public Forest Lands Handbook.
7.1.o. The management plan includes maps describing the resource base, the characteristics of general management zones, special management areas, and protected areas at a level of detail to achieve management objectives and protect sensitive sites.	C	All relevant maps are included in Chapters 800 and 900 of CF plans.

7.1.p. The management plan describes and justifies the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and techniques employed on the FMU to minimize or limit impacts to the resource.	C	Although there are general descriptions of harvesting equipment in WFMG, specific requirements for machinery or special provisions for harvesting are included in prescriptions for each harvest and described on Form 2460. Most harvesting on CF is done with processors and forwarders, generally considered to have minimal impacts on resources.
7.1.q. Plans for harvesting and other significant site-disturbing management activities required to carry out the management plan are prepared prior to implementation. Plans clearly describe the activity, the relationship to objectives, outcomes, any necessary environmental safeguards, health and safety measures, and include maps of adequate detail.	C	All elements of this indicator are addressed routinely in the harvest prescription and narrative completed before advertising timber sales. This is a multi-disciplinary process, usually involving DNR personnel with expertise in wildlife, fisheries, water, cultural features, etc.
7.1.r. The management plan describes the stakeholder consultation process.	C	Chapter 200 of CF plans describes elements of stakeholder consultation, but this is addressed more specifically by the state statute requiring environmental assessments of CF plans.
<b>C7.2. The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.</b>	C	
7.2.a The management plan is kept up to date. It is reviewed on an ongoing basis and is updated whenever necessary to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances. At a minimum, a full revision occurs every 10 years.	C	County forest managers are now directed to develop new comprehensive land use plans every 15 years by Wisconsin State Statute 28.11(5)(a), although the plans are living documents and updated frequently. Annual work plans follow the entry of new data from forest reconnaissance, and annual WisFIRS updates produce new 15-year harvest projections. However, an environmental assessment is only completed as part of the complete comprehensive land use plan revision.  The standard requires a full revision of the management plan at least every 10 years. Thus, there is a potential conflict between Wisconsin State Statutes directing DNR and County Forests to schedule plan revisions and the FSC Principles, Criteria, and Indicators. <b>See OBS 2012.3.</b>
<b>C7.3. Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.</b>	C	
7.3.a. Workers are qualified to properly implement the management plan; All forest workers are provided with sufficient guidance and supervision to adequately implement their respective components of the plan.	C	Professional education and training of county foresters and their DNR counterparts, Liaison Foresters, is excellent. Frequent training courses are well attended, as are professional meetings. Training logs are maintained and were examined during the audit.

<b>C7.4. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.</b>	C	
7.4.a. While respecting landowner confidentiality, the management plan or a management plan summary that outlines the elements of the plan described in Criterion 7.1 is available to the public either at no charge or a nominal fee.	C	CF management plans, annual work plans, and annual reports are posted on county web pages in most counties, and are available in other formats upon request. Monthly meetings with Forestry and Recreation Committees in each county are open to the public. (Note: all counties have such a committee, but committee names vary).
7.4.b. Managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment prior to their implementation. Managers address public comments and modify the plans to ensure compliance with this Standard.	C	Public review is a normal part of the process of plan development and plan approval, including the accompanying environmental assessment. Both draft and final plans are made available for public input.
<b>P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</b>  <i>Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.</i>		
<b>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</b>	C	
8.2.a.1. For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.	C	WisFIRS is a comprehensive system for guiding the reconnaissance and inventory of forest compartments as well as for scheduling harvest and other management options of stands. All of the elements listed in this indicator are included in compartment reconnaissance (Public Forest Lands Handbook).
8.2.a.2. Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.	C	Data on any such losses would be gathered by a special recon inventory and entered into WisFIRS before annual updates of harvest scheduling.
8.2.b The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product		Careful records are kept (interview with administrative assistant in Wood County) of harvested timber and entered

and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.	C	into WisFIRS before annual updates on harvest scheduling. Records for harvest of NTFPs are maintained for firewood and for any products harvested by members of tribes.
<p>8.2.c. The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>;</li> <li>2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat;</li> <li>3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species;</li> <li>4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones;</li> <li>5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4).</li> </ol>	C	Most of these data are collected and maintained by personnel with Bureaus of Wildlife and Endangered Resources. Results of such monitoring are made available to county forest managers during periodic meetings of interdisciplinary teams and/or during review of proposed management operations.
8.2.d.1. Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.	C	County and DNR foresters indicated that they visit active harvest operations 2-3 times a week; assessment forms are in writing and were inspected during the field audit.
8.2.d.2. A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.	C	CF plans require annual reports and annual work plans. Work plans routinely report on the system of forest roads and make annual requests for road improvements and maintenance.
8.2.d.3. The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).	C	Administrators of county forests and their colleagues are active members of communities in the counties where they work, have offices interspersed with other county officials, and purchase most of their equipment and supplies locally. Thus, indirect monitoring of local and socioeconomic activity is ongoing.
8.2.d.4. Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.	C	County forest administrators appear to be in very close communication with their publics. Regular meetings with Forestry and Recreation Committees, with formal minutes, are held in each county. Members of the public are encouraged to attend.
8.2.d.5. Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).	C	Communication with tribal representatives is on-going, assuring that any opportunities for joint monitoring of cultural sites are made available to tribes.
8.2.e. The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess		As public lands, financial management of county forests is closely monitored both by county officials and state officials,

productivity and efficiency.	C	the result of substantial cost-sharing by DNR.
<b>C8.3. Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."</b>	C	
8.3.a. When forest products are being sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.	C	County forests use a trip-ticket system for tracking FSC-certified products. Tickets have three parts. When a load leaves the landing, one part is deposited in a lockbox on site. When delivered to the mill, a second ticket is maintained by the mill, and the third is returned to the county, along with mill weight or tally.
8.3.b The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.	C	Documentation was inspected in Wood County, and was adequate for tracking harvested material. All counties follow the same procedures.
<b>C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</b>	C	
8.4.a. The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan.	C	An obvious advantage of the process of required annual updates to recon and WisFIRS, and the resulting output from WisFIRS with new 15-year harvest projections, is that annual work plans are the mechanism for monitoring objectives in the management plan.
8.4.b. Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.	C	See above. Annual work plans, based on new data gathered each year, assure that objectives and guidelines for management are modified as necessary.
<b>C8.5. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.</b>	C	
8.5.a. While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is		The public is welcome to visit County Forest Administrator's offices anytime and request monitoring information.



maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.	C	However, annual reports and annual work plans present summaries of monitoring and are usually available on county web sites, or by request in offices.
<b>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</b>		
<b>C9.3. The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.</b>	C	
9.3.a. The management plan and relevant operational plans describe the measures necessary to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of all high conservation values present in all identified HCVF areas, including the precautions required to avoid risks or impacts to such values (see Principle 7). These measures are implemented.	C	Well illustrated by the plan for Lincoln County, Chapter 500 presents a discussion of the ecological values of several areas that are identified for Significant Biological Diversity. Although there are no areas now listed as HCVF and part of the State Natural Areas system, these areas clearly are managed in a precautionary manner. Other counties do have SNAs, with appropriate precautions presented in Chapter 500 of management plans.
9.3.b. All management activities in HCVFs must maintain or enhance the high conservation values and the extent of the HCVF.	C	Areas that have been designated as HCVF are part of the SNA system, whereby management plans are developed in cooperation with the Bureau of Endangered Resources.
9.3.c. If HCVF attributes cross ownership boundaries and where maintenance of the HCV attributes would be improved by coordinated management, then the forest owner or manager attempts to coordinate conservation efforts with adjacent landowners.	C	Such coordination of management occurs regularly in Wisconsin, with county forest administration tied closely to DNR liaison. Other examples of cooperation involve the US Forest Service. Some SNAs even cross state borders, with coordinated management.
<b>C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</b>	C	
9.4.a. The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.	C	Monitoring of HCVF on SNAs is a major goal of the SNA program, and is required by the state legislature. 25-30% of SNA are formally monitored each year (detailed monitoring form examined during audit), but other sites are monitored informally by a combination of DNR (including SNA) personnel and county foresters.
9.4.b. When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the	C	Appropriate alterations to management in HCVF are to be expected, given the careful monitoring and cooperation between county forests and the various divisions of DNR. No examples were observed in counties visited during the 2012

trend.		audit, however.
--------	--	-----------------

**Appendix 7 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs**

☒ Chain of Custody indicators were not evaluated during this annual audit.

**Appendix 8 – Group Management Program Members**



WI COunty Forest  
Aministrators Contact